

MYP moderation report

School Victoria Shanghai Academy

Subject: MATHEMATICS **Level:** MY **Component:** INTERNAL ASSESSMENT

June 2012 - This report should be read in conjunction with the general report for this subject.

Section A General Comments

Was the correct number of student folders submitted?

Yes

If not, was an adequate explanation given?

N/A

Was there a separate background information folder?

Yes

Was the correct distribution of comparatively good, average and comparatively weak student work included?

No

If not, was an adequate explanation given?

Yes

Were the prescribed minimum tasks included?

Yes

Was the moderation checklist included?

Yes

Was the previous year's report included?

Yes

Were unit planners included?

Yes

Were the F3.1 forms completed correctly?

Yes

Was the correct number of judgments given against each criterion?

Yes

Were the same tasks included for all students?

Yes

If not, was an adequate explanation given?

N/A

Was the sample easy to follow?

Yes

Had recommendations from the previous report been followed?

Most

Section B Assessment tasks

Task 1 (Please insert title)

The Bench

Brief description of the task

The students were required to design a water front bench with a canopy for the Polynomial Seating Company (PSC). They were required to use quadratic functions to define the shape of the bench. The bench needed to be comfortable and to protect the user against the sun and the rain.

Students were given two weeks to complete the task. Some was done in class and some for homework. Students were allowed to use GeoGeBra.

As indicated by the teacher, if a student used a function which had not been introduced to them in class in their design they were able to achieve a level 7-8.

This task was submitted for moderation last year. This task was assessed against criteria A, C, and D, but only A and D were submitted for moderation.

Did the design of the task allow students to reach the highest levels of the criteria?

Yes

Comments

This task was suitably assessed against criteria A and D.

Comments on the application of the assessment criteria and any change of levels

The moderation team lowered the level of Joshua Hui from level 6 to level 5 in criterion A because he did not "generally" make appropriate deductions when solving the challenging problems indicated by the teacher in the task-specific clarifications. In fact, he only succeeded in one of the three points indicated by the teacher for level 5-6.

The moderation team was in agreement with all the remaining awarded levels.

Was the background information adequate?

Yes

Task 2 (Please insert title)

Patterns in Probability

Brief description of the task

This was a one-hour problem-solving task completed under examination conditions.

The students were required to find the number of different positions a person could occupy after different numbers of coin tosses. If the coin lands on a head they move one step to the right and if it lands on a tail they move one step to the left.

The students were allowed to use their graphic display calculator. This task was assessed against criteria B and C.

Did the design of the task allow students to reach the highest levels of the criteria?

Yes

Comments

This task was suitably assessed against criteria B and C. Questions seven and 12 allowed students to provide justifications and/or proof for their rule.

Comments on the application of the assessment criteria and any change of levels

The moderation team was in agreement with all levels awarded by the teacher.

Was the background information adequate?

Yes

Comments

In the task-specific clarifications, the movement between different forms (for example, uses a grid/tree diagram and is able to form expressions) should be mentioned for level 5-6 of criterion C.

Task 3 (Please insert title)

A special Matrix

Brief description of the task

This investigation was completed during class time under test conditions for one hour and 40 minutes in a double period.

Part one was a 45-minute task used to assess criterion B and it consisted of nine questions.

Part two was a 55-minute task used to assess criterion D and it consisted of seven questions.

Graphic display calculators were allowed.

Did the design of the task allow students to reach the highest levels of the criteria?

No

Comments

This task was suitable as a theoretical mathematical reflection assessing criterion D.

However, part one, which was assessed against criterion B, did not allow students to achieve the highest levels of criterion B as students were not given the opportunity to select and apply their own problem-solving techniques. The task was too guided and hence Max(4).

Comments on the application of the assessment criteria and any change of levels

The moderation team agreed with most of the levels allocated.

Joshua Hui's level was lowered from level 3 to level 0 for criterion B as he did not reach the standard of any of the descriptors. He set up the matrices but none of his calculations were correct. He was not able to apply any mathematical techniques.

Was the background information adequate?

Yes

Task 4 (Please insert title)

A Broad-based test

Brief description of the task

This broad-based test was done in one hour and 40 minutes and it covered three branches of mathematics: Algebra, Geometry and trigonometry, and Statistics and Probability.

The test was divided into four parts distributed on four bands: Part A (level 1-2), Part B (level 3-4), Part C (level 5-6), and Part D (level 7-8).

Did the design of the task allow students to reach the highest levels of the criteria?

Yes

Comments

This task was suitably assessed against criteria A and C.

Part D allowed students to achieve the highest levels for criterion A. The students were given the opportunity to move between different forms of representation throughout the test, although this was not specifically mentioned in the task-specific clarifications. Question four will need to be changed as indicated in the solutions.

Comments on the application of the assessment criteria and any change of levels

The moderation team lowered the level of Joshua Hui from level 3 to level 2 because he did not "generally" make appropriate deductions when solving more complex problems. In fact, he solved correctly only three of the 10 questions in Part A (level 1-2) and three of the nine questions in Part B (level 3-4), and these three questions were only involving simple reflections.

The moderation team also lowered the levels of Tasha Casberg and Andrew Lau from level 3 to level 2 in criterion C because they only showed a basic use of mathematical language and their papers were incomplete.

Was the background information adequate?

Yes

Section C Summary of the use of the assessment criteria**Were there any discrepancies in the levels awarded?**

Yes

Comments (This box is for brief general comments on any problematic criteria)

The discrepancies were due to the reasons explained in comments on each task.

Section D**Are there any points that must be addressed for future samples in order to comply with moderation requirements?**

Yes

Points

For criterion B, "Tasks should allow students to choose their own mathematical techniques to investigate problems, and to reason from the specific to the general" (See the "Mathematics assessment criteria" section in the MYP Mathematics guide, 2011)

Are there any suggestions that the school might wish to consider?

Yes

Suggestions

The moderation team acknowledges that there has been significant improvement in the tasks and background information since the June 2011 moderation session.

Continue using task-specific clarifications. However, please ensure that they reflect the guide descriptors.

The moderation team suggests the use of the standard MYP Unit Planners.

The moderation team thanks you for submitting the sample and hopes that the report will be of assistance during the next academic year.